

RECEIVED

0137

SEP 05 2001

550699

19 MR. PERNA: I'm Frank Perna.

20 MODERATOR LAWSON: I just wanted -- is Calvin

21 Meyers here? No, you can stay. You're up.

22 MR. PERNA: I know, I forgot something.

23 MODERATOR LAWSON: Calvin Meyers and Tosawii.

24 Okay, so Frank Perna is our next speaker.

25 MR. PERNA: My name is Frank Perna. I am a

0138

1 resident of Clark County. I want to protest the

2 Department of Energy's action enforcing this meeting to

3 be held in this federal building. The symbolism of

4 having a meeting in a guarded, barbed wire compound

5 reinforces the unfair, inequitable, arrogant and

6 unscientific process, ignoring state sovereignty and

7 Nevadans' wishes, while attempting to prove Yucca

8 Mountain is suitable as a nuclear repository.

9 The Department of Energy, Secretary Abraham,

10 should have been in attendance, because this would have

11 given us all a chance to have him carry a message to

12 President Bush, and the message is, don't dump on us.

13 And the reason for me saying that, I have a little flag

14 here that I made, and it has "don't dump" on it, and

550699

15 it's a paraphrase of the 1775 revolutionary models,
16 don't tread on me, or don't tread upon us. And I had a
17 little chance to see what the DOE thinks, respects
18 citizens. And they're either arrogant or they're
19 ignorant. One or the other. Because they stopped me
20 from bringing those placards.

21 Now, last Sunday I carried those in the
22 Citizen Alert walk down the strip. And they're
23 protected by the First Amendment. Protected by the
24 Supreme Court under nonverbal communication. That's
25 the same thing that protected the guys that burned the
0139

1 flags. They said it's okay to burn the flag. That's a
2 nonverbal communication. So I come into this federal
3 building, and they're stopping me from having nonverbal
4 communication. Flag burners is okay. I guess they
5 wouldn't mind if they burn flags out there, but that's
6 one thing. I don't think they have the correct respect
7 for citizens. They certainly don't have it for
8 Nevadans.

9 Now we're hearing a couple of types of
10 arguments about the pro-nuclear people. They say we
11 should be delighted to get more jobs. Well, the people

550699

12 in the test site said that all the while it was
13 operating. You tell them something, they'd say, "Oh,
14 no, it's wonderful, it's a great, the DOE is protecting
15 us." Well, the sad reality was that the test site
16 killed many Nevadans, many downwinders, made them sick.
17 And you know what, they had to fight the government to
18 ever get compensation. Did we get the truth out of the
19 DOE to protect these people? No. They had to go to
20 Congress and finally get compensation. So they protect
21 them, so the same argument we're hearing now, there's
22 more jobs coming along, we should want this. It's a
23 lovely thing to have. I don't think it is.

24 Then we have the other argument, they say
25 well you have the NIMBY syndrome, not in my backyard

0140

1 syndrome. I'm going to tell you that the 1987
2 legislation was a NIMBY bill, because there were eight
3 other suitable sites, disregarded. You know why?
4 Because some Senator, some Congressman didn't want it
5 in his backyard. So it was a NIMBY bill.

6 (APPLAUSE)

7 Out of eight possible sites, they selected
8 one. You have two people in Congress today, Senator

550699

9 Murkowski, been there since 19, let's see, 1980, and,
10 that's another story, and the Senator Domenici, who's
11 been there since 1972. Murkowski didn't want it in
12 Alaska, Domenici didn't want it in New Mexico. So
13 that's the NIMBY. To hell with the NIMBY, but don't
14 say we're not in our backyard. We are NIMBYs.

15 The other one is patriotism. We should want
16 to do it because our government wants it, as if we
17 could trust our government. I don't trust them. I
18 don't know if you do. But now let me -- the next thing
19 I want to do here is we were talking before about
20 Mr. Barrett, who's sitting there in the front and his
21 letter requesting our opinions. I was delighted to get
22 it. No one ever asked me for my opinion in a letter.
23 Anyway, here's the letter to Mr. Barrett. "I am
24 replying to your letter of August 28th, posing five
25 questions and a request for comments. The Nuclear

0141

1 Regulatory Commission recently requested the Department
2 of Energy provide basic information and reports
3 concerning radiation exposure, volcanic events, and the
4 rate of flow of water through Yucca Mountain.
5 Estimates for radiation and its effects on humans and

550699

6 the environment at Yucca Mountain were not consistent.

7 Also, more study was required because minerals in the

8 moisture in the tunnels and in the ground water could

9 corrode titanium and stainless steel waste packages.

10 Bill Bulky who was an NRC field representative, said --

11 and here's what he said, "The DOE has significant

12 deficiencies in its program." Now that was about,

13 beginning of August, I guess. August 21st, the DOE

14 made a claim that Yucca Mountain was scientifically

15 suited as a nuclear repository. This September 5th

16 meeting at the Sun Coast was set up and canceled and

17 reset for today at the DOE operation center.

18 MODERATOR LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

19 MR. PERNA: As far as I know, the DOE -- NRC

20 concerns weren't addressed. Why was the meeting set up

21 in such a short notice, with a comment period to end

22 September 20th? I haven't seen the PSSE, the report

23 we're talking about, and even if I had, 468 pages would

24 be difficult to digest in such a short period.

25 It was also unfair scheduling. This meeting,

0142

1 it was unfair scheduling this meeting after the Labor

2 Day weekend.

550699

3 The second question concerns the EPA and NRC
4 radiation standards, which are the subject of
5 litigation by the nuclear lobby. They don't want the
6 EPA 25 millirem standard 12 miles from Yucca Mountain.
7 Or the 4 millirem water standard. In fact, the nuclear
8 lobby wants no standards, and that says something. Why
9 don't they want standards? The State of Nevada has
10 sued to increase the standards on air and water, by
11 reading them closer to Yucca Mountain. The NRC wants
12 no water standard. Why don't they want a water
13 standard? You know, the test site, there's a plume
14 going into Death Valley of radiation. If we had to
15 depend on that water, we'd be up that creek

16 (LAUGHTER)

17 MODERATOR LAWSON: Mr. Perna, I've got to ask
18 you summarize your comments. You're well over the time
19 now.

20 MR. PERNA: Just let me read another
21 paragraph, and then I will go. Secretary Abraham
22 should not recommend the site to President Bush,
23 because geological disposal is far worse than dry cask
24 storage on site, which has a 44-year safety record.
25 Nobody mentioned that, 1957, the first plant went on

0143

1 line. All that waste is on site. The nuclear industry
2 wants it off-site. You want to know why? They don't
3 want to produce 20 percent of our power, they want to
4 produce 30 percent of our power. They don't give a
5 damn about us or future generations. Thank you.

550699